

# EXHIBIT 1

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA  
3 ALEXANDRIA DIVISION

4 ROSY GIRON DE REYES, )  
5 et al, ) Civil 16-563  
6 Plaintiffs, )  
7 v. )  
8 WAPLES MOBILE HOME PARK ) Alexandria, Virginia  
9 LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, ) September 23, 2020  
et al, )  
Defendants. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

10 TRANSCRIPT OF MOTION HEARING  
11 VIA ZOOM

12 BEFORE THE HONORABLE T. S. ELLIS  
13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

14  
15 APPEARANCES:

16 For the Plaintiffs: Simon Yehuda Sandoval-Moshenberg  
17 Gianna Puccinelli  
18 Nady Peralta  
Matthew Traupman

19 For the Defendants: Michael Sterling Dingman  
20 Grayson Hanes  
21 Justin deBettencourt  
Grayson Hanes

22 Court Reporter: PATRICIA A. KANESHIRO-MILLER, RMR, CRR  
23

24 Proceedings reported by stenotype shorthand.  
25 Transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

1 Circuit suggested? Is that the plaintiffs' position?

2 MS. PUCCINELLI: No, Your Honor. Plaintiffs contend  
3 that we should only be proceeding to trial on the disparate  
4 impact theory of the Fair Housing Act claim.

5 THE COURT: All right. And as to that, it's the  
6 position of the plaintiffs that it should proceed to trial on  
7 all three steps of the analysis as identified by the Fourth  
8 Circuit?

9 MS. PUCCINELLI: That is correct, Your Honor.

10 THE COURT: All right. Now, with respect to the  
11 arguments that I have heard, you might reiterate, just to  
12 refresh my recollection, what is the plaintiffs' position on  
13 the effect, if any, of the anti-harboring statute on the  
14 plaintiffs' claim in this case?

15 MS. PUCCINELLI: Your Honor, plaintiffs' position is  
16 that the anti-harboring statute has no place in the analysis  
17 on step one. The Fourth Circuit's -- the Fourth Circuit's  
18 opinion clearly states, under the first step, the plaintiff  
19 must demonstrate a robust causal connection between the  
20 defendants' challenged policy and the disparate impact on the  
21 protected class. And it goes -- the Fourth Circuit goes on  
22 to identify how plaintiffs have done that. And that's either  
23 through statistical evidence or other evidence that  
24 specifically links the policy at issue with a  
25 disproportionate impact on the protected class. And